

# A NEW YEAR'S GIFT

TO THE

LORD PROVOST, MAGISTRATES, AND TOWN COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF GLASGOW,

1ST JANUARY, 1874:

BEING AN ESSAY SHEWING THAT THE DELUSIVE

## PRACTICE OF VACCINATION

IS RUINOUS TO THE NATIONAL HEALTH.

BY ANTI-VACCINATOR.

---

GLASGOW:

JOHN THOMSON, 39 JOHN STREET.

GLASGOW:  
HAY NISBET, PRINTER.  
164 TRONGATE.

GLASGOW  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

*To the LORD PROVOST, MAGISTRATES, and TOWN  
COUNCIL of the City of Glasgow.*

MY LORD AND GENTLEMEN,

I BEG respectfully to request your acceptance of this New Year's Gift, and to solicit your careful and unprejudiced perusal of its contents.

The subject, if not the most important, is at least one of the important questions engaging public attention at the present time.

The people are now beginning to examine and think for themselves in regard to this matter, and will not much longer be deluded by the deceptive term of "pure lymph," and forced by a tyrannous Compulsory Vaccination Act of Parliament to poison their children.

Vaccination, like its predecessor, Inoculation (now rendered penal), cannot much longer be endured. Be warned in time, enquire into the truth of what is here advanced, and when convinced, act accordingly: have all the Free Vaccination Traps shut up, petition for the immediate repeal of the Compulsory

Vaccination Act, and leave the parents at liberty to judge for themselves on this all-important subject, so closely connected with the welfare of their own children.

I am,

My Lord and Gentlemen,

Yours respectfully,

ANTI-VACCINATOR.

GLASGOW, *1st January*, 1874.

# VACCINATION.

---

MISS MARTINEAU very wisely remarks—"If men and women are to be absolved from the care of their own lives and limbs, and the responsibility cast upon anybody else by the law of the land, the law of the land is lapsing into barbarism." This is most unquestionably true, and applicable to some of those laws on our statute book that profess to have for their object the welfare of society, but the real end of which is in too many instances the benefits to be derived from their operation by interested persons. Amongst the most objectionable of these may be named the Compulsory Vaccination Acts. In no single instance, perhaps, in the history of British legislature, can we find laws whose influence upon society is more prejudicial to the health of the people than these said Vaccination Acts. They profess to protect against small-pox, and thereby leave the person who has been operated upon in a totally false position—since they afford no protection whatever against that malady—whilst they really become the agents of spreading many foul and fatal diseases. Vaccination of itself is bad enough, as we shall show hereafter, but compulsory vaccination is a tyranny that no free people should for one moment submit to. It has sapped the very vitals of the health of the people already, and if allowed to go on, the mischief that may result from it it is quite impossible to imagine.

Dr. James B. Russell has recently put forth a "Report of the City of Glasgow Fever Hospitals," in which document he has set up a defence of vaccination, which, from its one-sided statements, is calculated to show that there may be some benefits arising from the Jennerian operation. This

fact has led me to give the public the real facts bearing on this question, in order that they may judge of the true value of vaccination, and of Dr. Russell's defence of its practice.

In commencing a discussion of this important question, I may remark that there is a considerable prejudice in the medical mind against a layman having an opinion on the subject at all, the whole matter being held to be a purely medical question, and such, therefore, as only members of the faculty can judge of with any degree of accuracy. This is assuredly a very great mistake. It is a question that concerns the health of the entire population, and one in which the freedom of the whole people is involved, and to say that they should not be allowed to have an opinion on the subject, is to advocate a medical despotism that would be simply unbearable to men who have fought for freedom in the past, and who prize it dearly in the present. Dr. H. Alleyne Nicholson, in a pamphlet issued at Manchester some three or four years since, in defence of vaccination, remarks in reference to this subject—"In this case the collective sense of the medical profession, is the collective sense of the nation, since without dreaming of asserting medical infallibility, there is no doubt but that the great bulk and all the leading members of the medical faculty are in favour of vaccination, and the question is one of the merits of which they alone are at present qualified to judge." Now, in the first place, it is not correct to say that all the leading members of the profession are in favour of vaccination, since a score or two of illustrious examples to the contrary will be quoted hereafter ; and the quotations that shall be given as we proceed from the works of eminent medical men against vaccination will show that the profession is by no means unanimous on the subject. But even if they were, the argument would be little worth. The profession in the past has not shown itself so competent to judge of questions of this character that its *ipse dixit* can be taken to-day without inquiry as to its truth. We cannot forget that when vaccination was first proposed by Jenner, the entire faculty denounced it most vehemently, and voted its originator one of

the vilest of quacks. The Royal College of Physicians in London refused Dr. Jenner their license to practice, and the profession, from the highest to the lowest, laughed to scorn the preposterous idea that matter taken from a cow could produce any beneficial results when introduced into the human body. Now, we ask, was the profession of that day competent to judge of the value of vaccination? If so, we are content to accept its decision, and abide by it to-day. If not, on what ground, we inquire, can it be shown that the medical men of to-day are any more competent to decide the question than their predecessors of seventy years ago? The profession has never led public opinion, but has always followed in the wake of the views of others. Whenever any new discovery has been made, or a change of opinion taken place on the part of the public, the faculty has first opposed, then tolerated, and in the end, defended the novelty. The time was when inoculation was as firmly believed in by the entire medical profession as is vaccination to-day, and had any one at that time attempted to show that the habit of transmitting small-pox from one person to another was an evil, he would have been met with precisely the same arguments as those advanced by Dr. Nicholson to-day—viz., that it was a question for medical men to decide, and they were unanimous in recommending it. As time went on, however, it became apparent that inoculation was a frightful source of disease, and in the end the entire profession gave up and opposed that which had been previously so strenuously defended. Dr. Moore in his "History of the Small Pox," says of inoculation, that it "occasioned the loss of millions of lives," a statement which every one who has paid any attention to the subject knows to be perfectly correct. Yet this same inoculation was defended, tooth and nail, for a long series of years, by almost every medical man of note. There can be little doubt, that when the present fashion has changed, and the prejudice in favour of vaccination shall have passed away, and medical men can look back calmly and impartially on the history of the past, they will see, that if inoculation



sacrificed millions of lives, vaccination destroyed its tens of millions. It is simply a question of time, for fashions change in medicines as in all things else. Sir John Forbes, no mean authority surely, says of the profession of which he was so illustrious a member,—“In the long succession of human generations almost everything possible, physical or moral, was at one time or other tried, with the view of proving its possession or non-possession of remedial powers. The necessary consequence has been the fixing in the minds of men, not merely of the professors of the medical art, but of mankind in general, these two notions—first, that nature was inadequate to the cure of most diseases, certainly of severe diseases; and secondly, that art was adequate. And these notions have not only come down to us as heir-looms of physis, but have been almost universally received as axioms without investigation, both by the medical profession and the public. The result of all this has been, that the members of the medical profession, at all times, and more especially in modern times, have been kept in a state of forced ignorance of the natural progress and event of diseases—in other words, of the true natural history of diseases in the human body; and they have been, and continue to be almost as ignorant of the actual power of remedies in modifying, controlling, or removing diseases, and from the self-same cause, viz., that as art has almost always been permitted to interfere in the morbid process, it has been impossible to say what part, if any, of the result was attributable to nature, or what part to the remedies employed.” What was the fate of the illustrious Harvey when he announced his great discovery of the circulation of the blood? Were medical men unanimous in accepting it? Why, it is well known they opposed it with all the vehemence they could command. According to Dr. Nicholson, their opinion should have been final and conclusive. Yet if it had been so, where would medical science have been to-day? An able writer in the *Westminster Review* remarks,—“John Aubrey tells us that he had heard Harvey say, that after his book on the circulation of the blood came out, he fell mightily in his



practice—'twas believed by the vulgar that he was crack-brained, and all the physicians were against him. He was derisively called the circulator, and his views were at first rejected almost universally. The older intellects in possession of the seats and places of authority regarded them as idle dreams. They were publicly assailed by a Dr. Primerose, a pupil of Johannes Riolanus, the distinguished professor of anatomy in the University of Paris; by Riolaunus himself, by Parisanus, a physician of Venice, and by Caspar Hoffman, the learned and laborious professor of Nuremberg, whom Harvey visited in vain for the sake of demonstrating to him the truth of his discovery. And Vestingius, professor in the University of Padua, and one of the best anatomists of the age, addressed two letters to Harvey, in which he states his objection to the new doctrine. Such was the truth-discerning power of the great intellectual lights of medicine in Harvey's day." Ambrose Paré, who first applied the ligature to arteries after amputation, was subjected to ridicule by the French faculty of medicine, for hanging human life on a thread, when boiling pitch had stood the test of centuries. When Dr. Grænwalt first employed cantharides internally, and his cures began to make a noise, he was at once committed to Newgate by warrant of the President of the Royal College of Physicians. Bleeding was once unanimously approved of by the profession, whilst to-day there are but few, very few, who would say a single word in its favour. There is, moreover, another reason why the medical profession cannot be considered best competent to judge of this question of vaccination, which is, that they are not likely to be impartial, having a large pecuniary interest at stake in the present state of things. Something like £300,000 is paid every year out of the poor rates of the country alone for parochial vaccination, to say nothing of the fees that medical men receive for performing the operation in private families; and with this enormous interest at stake, it is not in human nature for the judgment to be left perfectly free. I by no means assert that medical men keep up vaccination in consequence of the pecuniary advantages they reap

from its practice, but I do say that most men's minds are very likely to become biased on the side on which their interests lie, and that most certainly such men are not the best and most impartial judges of the matter in which they have a pecuniary interest involved.

The question is not essentially a medical one. It deals with matters of which every person should be competent to judge, the more especially as the liberty of the subject is largely involved in the practice. Everyone should be allowed to have an opinion on a matter in which the health of his children is at stake, and any law that interferes with this is an iniquitous law that ought never to be allowed to disgrace the statute books of a free people. When compulsory vaccination was first proposed, the late Sir Robert Peel gave it his most determined opposition, on the ground that such a law was directly opposed to the habits of the British people, who would never submit to the tyranny involved. Since that time they have submitted, and in this have shown a want of that intense love of freedom which actuated the conduct of their forefathers in the glorious days of the past.

The history of vaccination is interesting. During the last century, epidemics of various kinds—of course, including small-pox—prevailed largely. This was in a great measure due to the want of good sanitary arrangements, and to the habits of the people. Dr. Lyon Playfair, in a lecture delivered to the students at St. Mary's Hospital a year or two since, very wisely remarked, "Of the chronic and wide-spread filth (in the time of the Stuarts), arose the black death, the plague, the sweating sickness, and other pestilences, the consequences of bad hygienic conditions." He might have added small-pox also, for it unquestionably arises under precisely similar conditions. It is customary now to suppose that small-pox is an exception to this rule, and that it can only spread by contagion, as though there never had been a first case where no contagion from a previous case could possibly have existed. Dr. Nicholson, previously referred to, remarks, "In the first place, it is a mistake to suppose that small-pox

can be generated by bad diet, ill-ventilated dwellings, bad drainage, or bad hygienic arrangements of any kind. These things may predispose to the reception of the poison, and doubtless, in all cases, aggravate the disease; but they do not produce it. The case is different with typhus, and probably with typhoid fever, both of which we have reason to suppose may be generated by defective sanitary arrangements, as well as propagated by contagion, when once produced. It follows that though we might almost certainly annihilate typhus fever by sanitary improvements, we must not hope to eliminate small-pox from our list of diseases in the same way." This is assuredly the veriest nonsense. If small-pox cannot originate without a specific contagion, how in the name of all that's rational did the first case arise? Is small-pox eternal? Had it never a beginning? and if it had, there could clearly have been no contagion from which the first case sprang. If it could originate without contagion at first, it is difficult to say why the same thing cannot again happen. That which has been, may be again, and only requires the same conditions to produce it. Miss Florence Nightingale, whose experience on matters of this kind is worth that of half the medical profession, remarks very truthfully, "I was brought up both by scientific men and ignorant women distinctly to believe, that small-pox was a thing of which there was once a first specimen in the world, which went on propagating itself in a perpetual chain of descent, just as much as there was a first dog, and that small-pox would not begin itself any more than a new dog would begin, without there having been a parent dog. Since then I have seen with my eyes, and smelt with my nose, small-pox growing up in first specimens, either in close rooms or over-crowded wards where it could not by any possibility have been caught, but must have begun." These are sober and solemn facts, Dr. Nicholson's opinion notwithstanding.

Small-pox, then, prevailed largely in the early part of the last century, the cause being the terrible sanitary state of the country. Anything like a remedy or a means of alleviating the horrors of the disease would of course be eagerly caught

up. Under these circumstances it was that Lady Mary Wortley Montagu, who had been travelling in Turkey, where she had witnessed the performance of the operation of inoculation, introduced the practice into England of communicating small-pox to healthy persons so as to give them the malady artificially in a mild form, and thus prevent them from having it in greater severity naturally. This new scheme, promising as it did, to mitigate the horrors of a disease that was always looked upon with a good deal of loathing, was eagerly taken up by a large number of people. The profession, however, offered it most violent opposition, and Lady Montagu was made the victim of a good deal of persecution. Lord Wharncliffe, who has written her life, says that she seldom passed a day without repenting of her patriotic undertaking, and that she affirmed positively, that could she have foreseen the persecution, vexation and obloquy that it brought upon her, she would never have enlisted in the cause. The end was, however, that the new practice increased in favour until it became popular, and then Royal Colleges and humble practitioners alike adopted it. Now, by means of inoculation, small-pox, of course, became ten times more prevalent than it had been before. The disease was, in truth, sown broadcast over the land. Those who would have escaped it in the natural way, took it artificially, and victims were struck down by thousands on every hand. No wonder that we hear so much about the number of pock-marked people who were to be met with during the latter part of the last and the early part of the present century. The wonder is that any escaped, since not only was the disease propagated by direct inoculation, but each inoculated person became a fresh centre of contagion, and thus communicated the malady to large numbers of other healthy persons. Dr. Moore, referring to the fact that small-pox produced by inoculation, was every bit as contagious as that taken naturally, remarks, "Dr. Wagstaffe exemplified this by a late occurrence in the city of Hertford, where, in consequence of a few inoculations, the small-pox had spread through the town and occasioned a *prodigious*



*mortality.*" In another part of his book he notices the circumstance of a charity being established in London, where the poor might be inoculated, and remain isolated until they recovered, but he adds, "Unhappily, the wise regulations of the humane founders of this charity were afterwards entirely altered, when all who applied at the gates of the hospital were promiscuously inoculated with the small-pox, and suffered to wander abroad, *diffusing far and wide the mortal infection.*" Thus small-pox became almost universal, and the death-rate from it alarmingly high.

Now came what is termed the great and glorious discovery of Jenner, a discovery which, we shall hereafter show, instituted if possible a still worse state of things. Dr. Jenner was practising his profession at Sodbury, in Gloucestershire, and the small-pox appears to have been somewhat prevalent in the neighbourhood. On conversing one day on the subject with a servant girl, she remarked to the doctor, "Ah, I cannot take the small-pox, as I have had the cow-pox." This incident, we are informed, made a strong impression on the mind of Jenner. Why it should have done so it is difficult to conceive, since he could have heard a score of equally ridiculous statements from any servant girl that he might have happened to come into contact with. However, he went to work, to enquire into the matter, and very speedily arrived at the conclusion that the girl was right, that a vaccinated person never could take small-pox under any circumstances, and that therefore vaccination was the true and only preventive of this loathsome malady. He consequently published a work on the subject, at the latter part of the last century, and performed his first vaccination operation on May 14, 1796. As a matter of course, vaccination, now that inoculation had become popular, was violently opposed by the medical profession. Jenner was denounced as a charlatan; the clergy preached sermons against him, some of them declaring that he was Antichrist, and that vaccination was the real "mark of the Beast" spoken of in Scripture; the public ridiculed the whole thing, and vaccinators then were treated just as anti-

vaccinators are to-day—as persons somewhat deficient in brains. By-and-by, one after another of the public took up the new scheme, the members of the profession began to look more favourably upon it, and, in 1807, the Royal College of Physicians reported favourably of the operation. Now the tide had set in in its favour, and once again the fashion changed in medicine by rendering popular one of the vilest pieces of quackery that has ever disgraced the medical profession. The Royal College of Surgeons seem to have been more reluctant to adopt the new remedy, for when asked their opinion on the subject, by a French Commission, composed of twelve celebrities of the time, they said, they could not pronounce on the merits of vaccination without further experience, and added—“Vaccination can never supersede inoculation, because it does not protect in so sure and durable a manner.” In the end this College also gave way, and vaccination became a recognised operation. Since then it has had a pretty fair trial, with what result we shall endeavour to show. Acts of Parliament have been passed in its interest, special instruction has been imparted to young surgeons regarding the mode of performing the operation, everything has been done in its favour that human intellects could suggest, and therefore, if there be any value at all in it, the beneficial results should be apparent indeed.

The mode in which we can judge most satisfactorily of what has been accomplished by vaccination in the way of improving the health of the community, will be to compare the present state of things with that which existed in the early part of the century. As a matter of course, as soon as inoculation ceased to be performed—which it did when vaccination became general—the cases of small-pox diminished. This any one can easily see was due to the discontinuing to spread the disease by communicating it to healthy persons. It required no remedial or preventive agent to explain this fact. As the malady had been sown broadcast before by inoculation, so, as soon as the seed ceased to be sown, of course the harvest became less abundant. Since that time vaccination has had

all the credit of the lessened mortality from small-pox. To prove this to be the fact, it should be shown that as vaccination became more general, small-pox became less prevalent. Every year the Vaccination Acts have been more stringently enforced, and if the Jennerite theory were sound, small-pox should be almost, if not entirely, unknown at the present time. It was claimed for vaccination by Jenner that it was a thorough protection against small-pox, and that the person who had been operated upon was for ever after secure against an attack of this disease. If to-day we point to persons who have been vaccinated and have afterwards taken small-pox and died of it, we are told that vaccination is not a thorough protection, that although the operation does not always prevent the person whose system has been impregnated with "cow-pox" from taking the small-pox, that yet it does very considerably mitigate the severity of the attack. Now this mitigation hypothesis has been adopted recently as a loophole out of which vaccinators might escape from the difficulties of their position. Dr. Jenner held that the person who had once been vaccinated never could take the small-pox during the whole course of his life. His words are—"What renders the cow-pox virus so extremely singular is, that the person who has been thus affected is for ever after secure from the infection of the small-pox." "For ever after secure." There can be no mistake about these words. The person protected by vaccination was to be secure against small-pox for the rest of his life. In another place Jenner remarks to the same effect—"The scepticism that appeared even among the most enlightened of medical men, when my sentiments on the important subject of the cow-pox were first promulgated, was highly laudable. To have admitted the truth of a doctrine at once so novel and so unlike anything that had ever appeared in the annals of medicine, without the test of the most rigid scrutiny, would have bordered upon temerity; but now, when that scrutiny has taken place, not only among ourselves, but in the first professional circles in Europe, and when it has been uniformly found in such abundant instances,



that the human frame, when once it has felt the influence of the genuine cow-pox in the way that has been described, is *never afterwards at any period of its existence assailable by the small-pox*, may I not with perfect confidence congratulate my country and society at large on their beholding, in the mild form of the cow-pox, an antidote that is capable of extirpating from the earth a disease which is every hour devouring its victims, a disease that has ever been considered as the severest scourge of the human race?" Sir Gilbert Blane, at that time physician to the Court, says of vaccination:—"It is demonstrable, that if at the first moment of this singular discovery, at any moment since, at the present or any future moment, mankind were sufficiently wise and decided to vaccinate the whole of the human species who have not gone through the small-pox, from that moment would this most loathsome and afflicting of all the scourges of humanity be instantaneously and for ever banished from the earth." We have here a most easy test by which to try vaccination. Is the vaccinated person protected to the extent that Jenner promised? Every one knows that he is not, since thousands of persons who have been vaccinated take small-pox, and die of it despite the so-called protection of vaccination. To escape from this difficulty the theory of mitigation has been resorted to; it, however, also breaks down, as we shall see hereafter. Now, if vaccination be not an entire preventive of small-pox, as its originator declared it to be, we have a right to demand to be informed how much protection it does afford, in order that we may know how to estimate its value.

We find that small-pox does attack the vaccinated still, seeming to pay very little regard indeed to "Jenner's glorious discovery." Dr. Gregory, for something like fifty years physician to the Small-pox Hospital in London, and a man who therefore knew probably more of small-pox and of the supposed protection afforded by vaccination than any other man living, remarks—"Small-pox does invade the vaccinated, and the extirpation of that dire disorder is an event as distant as when it was first heedlessly (and in my humble judgment

most presumptuously) anticipated by Jenner. I am driven to the conclusion that the susceptibility of the variolous miasin among vaccinated persons increases as life advances, the reverse of what happens in the unvaccinated portion of mankind, where the susceptibility of small-pox is greatest in infancy." There seems to be no immediate prospect of the extirpation of small-pox notwithstanding the fact that vaccination is now all but universal. In the Small-pox Hospital not only do we find large numbers of vaccinated persons, but the number increases yearly. Now, it must be borne in mind that, if Jenner's theory were sound, there ought not to be a single case of a vaccinated person in this hospital, and the fact that there are large numbers, proves conclusively that whatever good there may be in vaccination, Jenner was thoroughly in error as regards its protective power. There is another fact mentioned in the quotation from Dr. Gregory of tremendous import, viz., that the liability to small-pox increases as age advances in the vaccinated, but diminishes in the unvaccinated—that is, that a malady which before vaccination was introduced was simply a disease of childhood like measles, chicken-pox, &c., has since that time come to attack fatally large numbers of adult, middle-aged, and even old people. It is a rare thing for a case of small-pox to be met with in a middle-aged person who has not been vaccinated, but common enough after that operation has been performed. This subject I may return to again. To come back to the statistics of the Small-pox Hospital. The ratio of vaccinated cases to the whole admissions—a most important fact—stands as follows:—

In 1851-52,.....	66·7	per cent.	vaccinated.
1854-56,.....	71·2	„	„
1859-60, .....	78	„	„
1863-66,.....	81·1	„	„
1867,.....	84·1	„	„

The returns since 1867 are difficult to be obtained, but they show a still further increase of vaccinated cases. Taking, however, the 84 per cent. of persons who had been vaccinated,

what sort of protection does that argue from Jenner's operation? Out of every 100 persons in the Small-pox Hospital, 84 are vaccinated and 16 unvaccinated. This assuredly leaves a considerable balance of safety in favour of the unvaccinated. Clearly, therefore, it is safer, even as far as small-pox is concerned, to leave this operation alone.

A few years ago, whenever vaccination was spoken against, the objector was always met with some such statement as the following:—"Yes, it's all very well for you to oppose vaccination now that you have been reaping the advantages of it for seventy years. See how year by year the small-pox has diminished since vaccination has been introduced. Look at Sweden—a well vaccinated country—and there the mortality from small-pox was in 1846 only two in the entire country. Small-pox has been nearly stamped out by vaccination. Look at Ireland and Scotland, in both of which countries vaccination is more perfectly performed than in England, and here the small-pox cases are less." What happened? Why, just at the moment when vaccinators seemed to be expecting that the disease would altogether disappear in a year or two more, back it came with tenfold fury. It swept over the country like an avalanche, and struck down in its course young and old, male and female, taking no heed whatever of the nonsensical theory of vaccination. In Scotland, the deaths from small-pox became alarming, amounting in Glasgow and Edinburgh to one-fourth of the entire mortality, and in Leith to one-third; whilst in Ireland, at the early part of last year, the mortality from small-pox was so great that in Dublin it was ten times greater than in London. In Sweden, the well vaccinated country about which we had heard so much regarding the disappearance of small-pox, the mortality from that disease increased as follows in six years:—

In 1846,.....	2 deaths.
1847,.....	13    "
1848,.....	71    "
1849,.....	341   "
1850,.....	1,376   "
1851,.....	2,488   "

And what of England? Why, the epidemic reached a height such as had never been known since vaccination had been introduced. "According to the Registrar-General's Report," says Dr. Sexton, "the deaths from small-pox in eighteen English towns during 1870 and 1871 were as follows:—

In 1870,..... 1,259

1871,.....13,174

Now, what does this say for vaccination, before whose protecting influence small-pox was to have altogether disappeared? Surely these facts of themselves should be sufficient to show how useless this so-called discovery of Jenner has proved itself to be. Vaccination and small-pox clearly can exist together." Thus it is seen that vaccination has done nothing toward stamping out small-pox, or even lessening its violence.

It will doubtless be urged here that the numerous cases of small-pox happened amongst the unvaccinated. Well, let us see. The editor of the *Lancet*—a medical journal most bitter against anti-vaccinators—remarked in the issue for February 4, 1871:—"But though one of the great lessons of this epidemic is to be found in its illustrations of popular ignorance, there are other lessons to be learned from it both by legislators and medical practitioners. It is notorious that, *while a large proportion of the fatal cases occur to the unvaccinated, the majority of the cases happen in the vaccinated*. This is due partly to the fact that the majority of people are vaccinated, and partly to the fact that they have been vaccinated very indifferently. It is the fashion to justify the Privy Council principle of having few vaccinators, by disparaging the vaccinations done by private practitioners; and undoubtedly a good deal of this has not been of such a nature as Mr. Marson or Dr. Seaton would approve. But we do not blame practitioners for this; we blame the teaching of the schools, or rather the want of teaching." Here then—to whatever cause it may be ascribed—is an admission that the majority of the cases of small-pox "happen in the vaccinated." Of what possible value, then, is this sham thing vaccination? It seems tolerably clear that, according to the statement of



the *Lancet*—an authority not likely to err on the side of anti-vaccination—that Jenner's operation is no protection whatever against small-pox, but if anything the reverse. The following fact is very important as bearing on the case. In the *Lancet* of January 21, 1871, we read—"From the early part of the century cases of small-pox after vaccination have been increasing, and now amount to four-fifths of the cases." Now, from the Registrar-General's returns on an average of four years, it appears that 65·5 per cent. of the population are vaccinated, not quite two-thirds; yet these two-thirds furnish four-fifths of all the small-pox cases, whilst the unvaccinated one-third furnish but one-fifth. Thus it will be seen that two vaccinated to one unvaccinated persons take small-pox, supposing the numbers to be equal. Suppose two hundred persons, one hundred vaccinated and the other hundred unvaccinated, be submitted to the contagion of small-pox, it appears from these figures that the disease would attack thirty of the unvaccinated and sixty of the vaccinated. Let us, therefore, hear no more about the protection afforded by vaccination. It is perfectly clear that the protection is on the other side, and that the unvaccinated are in by far the safer position of the two.

This is also evident from a number of other facts. The following extract from a small tract written by Dr. Sexton, entitled "Vaccination Tested by Facts," has an important bearing on this question. "In Prussia every person is vaccinated and revaccinated, and therefore, according to the Jennerite theory, small-pox should be completely stamped out. Now, what are the facts? In Berlin during the three months ending December 31, 1871, the deaths from small-pox were 1830, whilst in partially vaccinated London they were only 980; yet the population of London is four times that of Berlin. If the mortality of London from small-pox during the three months under consideration had been equal to that of Berlin, it would have stood as follows:— $4 \times 1830 = 7320$ . But it was only 980, showing that the mortality from small-pox in this vaccinated and re-vaccinated Prussian

city, was seven-and-a-half times greater than in the very imperfectly vaccinated metropolis of England. Take again the British army. Here every man is revaccinated on enlisting, the operation being performed by a superior class of surgeons, and consequently no failure is likely to arise from want of skill on the part of the practitioner. In addition to this, the sanitary regulations are superior to those that prevail amongst civilians, and every case of disease is attended to the moment it makes its appearance, and watched carefully to the end. There surely should be no small-pox here, or, if by chance a few cases did make their appearance, they should be of a very mild form indeed, and such as could at once be checked. But what are the facts? Why, that the mortality from small-pox in the British army is greater than in the civil population, as the following figures will show:— In the ten years, 1857 to 1868, there were in the army 117 deaths from small-pox, *i.e.*, a death rate of 1.46 per 10,000 men, while, in the entire civil population over five years of age, the death rate was only 0.86 per 10,000. Now, it must not be forgotten, that in the army the victims were all men certainly over eighteen years of age; and yet, despite that fact, and all the other favourable circumstances named, small-pox is much more fatal in our re-vaccinated army than in the partially vaccinated and ill-attended civil population. What more is needed to show that this operation is a gigantic piece of quackery, a huge and hollow sham, realising to the full those well-known and graphic words, ‘a mockery, a delusion, and a snare.’ Well might Dr. Caron say, ‘The mortality from small-pox seems to increase with the number of vaccinations and re-vaccinations performed every day in Paris.’”

Now we have re-vaccination advocated. It seems that vaccination has been proved to be useless, and therefore the operation is to be repeated, in order to make it beneficial. According to Jenner, to be once vaccinated was to ensure thorough protection against small-pox for life; now it seems necessary to have the operation performed again and again. But we should, at least, be definitely informed as to how often

it may be necessary to repeat this operation, because if that be not known, there is still no certainty in the course of procedure adopted. Does it require doing every ten, seven, five, or three years, or even every twelvemonth? Not long since, the mayor of Brighton—himself a medical man—speaking of the great advantages of vaccination—I beg his pardon, of *re*-vaccination—stated, that he would stake his reputation on the fact, that he would take any number of persons re-vaccinated within a week, and subject them to the contagion of small-pox without their contracting the disease. Now mark, they must all have been re-vaccinated within a *week*. Does this mean that the virus loses some of its power after seven days; if so, we are really coming to a very pretty state of things. The theory that re-vaccination is necessary, is based upon the supposition that the power of the lymph becomes exhausted or worn out, and that, therefore, it is necessary to repeat the operation in order to afford fresh protection against the disease. Let us see how facts bear this out. The following extract from the Registrar General's Returns may help us to a solution of this problem. "The fatal cases of small-pox in London, which in the first five weeks of this year had averaged 151, rose to 211 last week, showing a further increase of 15 upon the previous week. The mortality from small-pox varies with age. Thus in the last week the annual rate per thousand in children under 5 years of age, 10·7; in young persons of 5 and under 20 it was 3·2; in persons of the age of 20-40 it was 2·6; in men and women of 40-60 it was 0·8; and after 60 the rate was nominal. This has an important bearing on the question. Does the protective power of vaccination wear out with time? The persons who died in 1871 at the age of 20-40 must have been born about the years 1831-51; while those who died at the age 40-60 must have been born 1811-31. Now, it is not likely that the numbers born 1811-31 were vaccinated in any larger proportion than those born twenty years later; the balance is probably on the other side; yet the mortality at the advanced age 40-60 was only one-third of the mortality at the age



20-40. The danger of dying from small-pox diminishes rapidly as age advances. The facts of the ten years 1851-1860 all over England bear out this deduction." From these figures, it is perfectly clear that the protection against small-pox becomes increased, not diminished, as the vaccinated persons grow older, that is as the effect of the vaccine lymph wears out. Infants who have been vaccinated only a few months, or at most a year or two, die of small-pox at the rate of more than ten per cent. Gradually as they get further away from the time when the operation was performed, and, therefore, when the lymph had its full power, the mortality becomes less, and goes on diminishing as years roll by, and the effect of the virus is lost. In point of fact, the more the lymph has become worn out, the less liability is there to small-pox; in other words, vaccination predisposes to, not prevents, this disease. And it does this upon the simplest of all principles, by lowering the vital tone of the system, and therefore rendering it more susceptible of every kind of disease, small-pox of course included. "The evidence from France," writes Mr. E. Proctor, "is even more remarkable. From the returns of the French Government, presented through the Minister of Commerce and Agriculture, and prepared by the Imperial Academy of Medicine, a translation of which lies before me, we find the following startling announcement:—'For every 88 cases of small-pox occurring in the ten Departments least vaccinated, there occurred 427 cases in the ten Departments most vaccinated; and for every one death in the ten Departments least vaccinated there were 49 in those most vaccinated.' That was in 1867, and in 1865 the tables give the following results:—'For every 16 deaths by small-pox occurring in the ten Departments least vaccinated, there occurred 106 in the ten most vaccinated.'"

I know that statistics are apt to mislead unless carefully scrutinised by experienced reasoners, but the validity of these deductions has never, I believe, been called in question, and they appear incontestably to show, that in France, vaccina-

tion, instead of being a protection, has been a fruitful propagator of the disease.

A further strong proof of this is to be found in the report for 1868, of Dr. Ducharme, first-class aide-major of the 1st Regiment of Voltigeurs of the Guard. The 1st and 2nd Regiments were lodged in exactly similar barracks, situated in the same court, and in all respects under similar conditions, except that the one had been re-vaccinated, the other not. Small-pox broke out, not among the latter, as it ought to have done, under the hypothesis of vaccination, but among the former—the “protected;” and became epidemic and confluent, carrying off “many victims—among others, one of the infirmiry assistants.” Dr. Ducharme inquires:—“To what should we attribute this epidemic in a regiment in which 437 re-vaccinations had been performed, where the hygienic conditions—as space, ventilation, and food—were excellent; when in the 2nd Regiment of Voltigeurs, lodged in precisely similar barracks, situated in the same court, but on whom no vaccination had yet been made, not a single case of small-pox existed?” M. Ancelon, struck with the displacement of small-pox in the age of the vaccinated, proves from statistics in a letter to the Minister of Instruction, that the vaccinated child of five years of age is more liable to small-pox than the unvaccinated child of the same age. He concludes that the certificate of vaccination exacted on admission to public schools is illusory, and that in this respect it is better to leave to parents an entire liberty. “Believe me,” writes the Rev. George Cardew, Rector of Helmingham, Suffolk, “the confidence of thousands is now shaken as to vaccination. On the Continent tens of thousands (and among them some of the first and most talented of the medical profession) have ceased to believe in it. Hundreds of persons in England—the number increasing every day—have decided it to be positive evil. Even the *Medical Times*, the English doctors’ own scientific paper, has admitted that one of the foulest of diseases is being propagated by it. And it is not the thoughtless but the thoughtful who have become its foes, not those who

take their opinions at second-hand, and simply follow a fashion or a flag unreasoning, but those who think for themselves, and have some foundation for their belief. It is they who, by careful, cautious investigation, have discovered evil, where good had been supposed, and without the slightest interest of their own to further, save inasmuch as that interest is bound up in the well-being of all, have thought it right to make known their convictions to the world, with a view, if possible, to stay the plague." And every day adds to the number of those who have made up their minds to be no longer fooled by medical men, but to think for themselves upon this question, and having done so, to claim that liberty which is their birth-right.

A few words with regard to the so-called lymph employed in vaccination may not be out of place here. The failure of the operation, and the bad consequences arising from it, are frequently put down to "bad lymph" (as if there was such a thing as good lymph), and it is contended that if "good matter" could be always obtained, all these evils might be avoided. The people who talk thus have probably never given themselves the trouble to ascertain what vaccine ichor really is, and therefore what qualities it is desirable for it to possess in order to be "pure." In the arm to arm practice, absurdly called vaccination — homocination being a much more accurate term — the virus is taken from one person and inserted into the arm of another, everything in regard to purity being supposed to depend upon the health of the individual from whom it is taken. This is of course very absurd, since what is employed is virus from a sore, which is itself the result of the introduction of matter from a previous sore, and so on through several generations in the past. Of course the purity of this virus will depend very largely on the health of the *whole of the persons* whose constitutions it has passed through, and as it is perfectly impossible to ascertain this, no guarantee for pure lymph can be given even were there any such thing as pure lymph in existence, which there most assuredly is not. In order to discover what "pure lymph"

is, we must ascertain what was the nature of that with which Jenner commenced vaccination. The disease that in his day was supposed to afford protection against small-pox is now invariably spoken of as "cow-pox." This, however, is a great mistake, unless the term be used in an entirely new sense. It was really and truly a disease produced from the discharge of the greasy heels of horses. The idea occurred to Jenner that the disease in the horse and small-pox might have the same origin. His words are—"There is a disease to which the horse is frequently subject. The farriers have termed it 'the grease.' It is an inflammation and swelling of the heel, from which issues matter possessing properties of a very peculiar kind, which seems capable of generating a disease in the human body which bears so strong a resemblance to small-pox, that I think it highly probable it may be the source of that disease." This absurd hypothesis—for absurd it most unquestionably is—is made the basis of the whole system of vaccination. The mode in which the disease is imparted to the cow—and therefore the only reason that the cow is mentioned at all in Jenner's scheme—is described by the originator of vaccination himself. He says—"In this dairy country, a great number of cows is kept. The office of milking is performed indiscriminately by men and maid servants. One of the former having applied dressings to the heels of a horse affected with the grease, incautiously milked the cows with some particles of the infectious matter adhering to his fingers. The disease thus communicated to the cows, and from the cows to the dairy maids, spreads through the farm, until most of the domestics and the cattle feel its unpleasant consequences. This disease has obtained the name of the cow-pox." Now, of course, this disease is not the genuine cow-pox that was tolerably prevalent in Jenner's time, but which has now, to a large extent, disappeared, in consequence of improved sanitary arrangements in the case of cattle; but a new disease produced by the grease from the heels of a consumptive horse. And this was the malady that was supposed to afford protection against small-pox! Jenner



is exceedingly particular on this score. He points out that ideopathic cow-pox, that is the disease ordinarily known as cow-pox, would afford no protection whatever, and that consequently vaccinators ought to be particularly careful as to the source of the lymph, always making quite sure that it came from the horse in the first onset. If that were not done, failure he holds was very likely to be the result. He says—and this is very important—“It is necessary to observe that pustulous sores frequently appear spontaneously on the nipples of cows, and instances have occurred of the hands of servants employed in milking being affected with sores in consequence, and even of their feeling an indisposition from absorption. These pustules are of a much milder nature than those which arise from that contagion which constitutes the true cow-pox. They are always free from the bluish, or livid tint, so conspicuous in the pustules of that disease; no erysipelas attends them, nor do they show any phagedenic disposition as in the other case, but terminate in a scab, without creating any apparent disorder in the cow. This complaint appears at various seasons of the year, but most commonly in the spring, when the cows are first taken from their winter food and fed with grass.

But this disease is not to be considered as similar in any respect to that of which I am treating, as it is incapable of producing any specific effects on the human constitution. However, it is of the greatest consequence to point it out here, lest the want of discrimination should occasion an idea of security from the infection of the small-pox which might prove delusive.” And in order that no mistake might arise, he remarks in another place, “That the source of the infection is a peculiar morbid matter arising in the horse, I feel no room for hesitation, being well convinced that it never appears among the cows (except it can be traced to a cow introduced among the general herd, which has been previously affected), unless they have been milked by some one who at the same time has the care of a horse affected with diseased heels.” It will be seen, therefore, that the cow-pox proper is no protec-

tion against small-pox, but that the matter, to be of any value, must have been obtained from the greasy heels of a diseased horse. Here is a point upon which modern vaccinators have completely set at defiance the doctrines of their master, and in their practice, therefore, they have no right to appeal to the authority of Jenner at all. Could the originator of vaccination appear to-day and witness the sad havoc produced by vaccination, he might justly disclaim any connection with the operation that now bears that name, and declare that its failure arose from the fact that his plan had not been followed in obtaining lymph from greasy heeled horses. With this theory it is difficult to see why the unfortunate cow was dragged into the business at all. If matter from greasy heeled horses was needed, it could be obtained direct, and one would think it far preferable to go to the stable-yard at once and leave the cow unmolested. And, indeed, this was sometimes done. In Baron's Life of Jenner, we find that the originator of vaccination did, in 1817, obtain the virus direct from the greasy heels of the horse, and with the matter thus obtained, he supplied the National Vaccine Establishment. And surely this was the most satisfactory course that could be adopted, since it saved a great deal of trouble to the vaccinator, and suffering to the poor, ill-used, unoffending cow.

It should never be forgotten, therefore, that vaccination commenced in the diseased matter of the greasy heels of the horse. This was the source of the first virus obtained by Jenner, and this it is therefore that has been circulating through human constitutions for seventy years. Is it any wonder that such deplorable results should follow in the wake of this most disgusting operation? What is the disease that produces greasy heels in the horse? Dr. W. J. Collins, M.R.C.S., England; L.R.C.P. Edinburgh, L.M., twenty years vaccine physician in Edinburgh and London, gives the following description:—"I have seen the fatty excreescence cut off and burnt with nitric acid, and other local treatment had recourse to; but the grapey-looking mass gradually in-

creased, the whole of the limb of the animal being implicated, and the fetor from the breath very offensive, especially in the latter stage of the disease, when the animals were obliged to be slaughtered. The *post mortem* appearances, by the way, must not be lost sight of, and are, in a pathological sense, very instructive. 1st, There was a general anæmic look of the body, wasting of the tissues, and an unusual thickening or fulness of the lymphatic glands. 2nd, Lips, tongue, and gums, covered with peculiar cankerous-looking ulcers, and much swollen; the whole mucous membrane much softened, and covered with dark livid spots—ulceration of the larynx and trachea. The lungs highly congested, and large cavities ramifying through the substance of the organ, filled with purulent matter, corresponding in every particular, both in fetor and character, to that exuding from the greasy heels, and which is seen in the last stage of consumption in the human subject.” Here you have a diseased animal, the sores on whose heels are exuding as dirty and filthy a discharge as it has ever been one’s fortune or misfortune to witness, and this mass of corruption is to be introduced into the healthy body of a human being in order to protect it from disease! Dr. Collins also says—“If I had the desire to describe one-third of the victims ruined by vaccination, the blood would stand still in your veins. I have not the least confidence in vaccination; it nauseates me, for it often transfers filthy and dangerous diseases from one to another, without offering any protection whatever.

“Oh, sense, thou art fled to brutish beasts,  
And men have lost their reason.”

With these facts before us, I think it is clearly proved that vaccination is the grossest delusion that has for many a day been witnessed. It originated in a dirty and foul disease, and is not likely therefore to be the means of spreading health; the theory that it either prevents or mitigates an attack of small-pox is altogether unfounded, the figures of Dr. James Russell notwithstanding. His statistics, such as they are, are utterly at variance with those of the



Registrar-General, and his conclusions entirely opposed to those of the most eminent authorities on the subject; for example, he says on p. 33, that "the older an unvaccinated person is, the more risks he runs of having the confluent or fatal form of the disease." Now this is directly antagonistic to the opinion of Dr. Gregory, the greatest authority on the subject that ever lived, who tells us, as has been already remarked, small-pox seldom attacks the *unvaccinated* adult. Dr. Gregory refused to have his own children vaccinated, and in the *Medical Times* for 27th January, 1852, he said the "idea of extinguishing the small-pox by vaccination is as absurd as chimerical—it is as irrational as presumptuous." The following statistics in reference to the London Hospital show the utter fallacy of Dr. Russell's statement. I quote from the evidence of Dr. Pearce given before the Committee of the House of Commons two years ago:—"In the Highgate Small-pox Hospital, 3,094 cases occurred in the sixteen years from 1836 to 1851, all vaccinated. Of these no less than 2,825 were above 15 years of age, and no less than 1,584 (considerably more than one-half) were between 20 and 30 years of age, while 1,058 (more than one-third the number at all ages) were 20 to 25 years of age. In one year (1866) no less than 118 vaccinated patients died of small-pox in that hospital. Coming to a more recent date (1871), we find in the Asylums Hospital, Hampstead, according to the report presented to the Board on Feb. 18, 1871, the following proportions of vaccinated and unvaccinated in the decades of life:—

Years of Age.	Vaccinated.	Unvaccinated.
Under 10 .....	46 .....	102
From 10 to 20, .....	193 .....	46
„ 20 to 40, .....	270 .....	51
Over 40, .....	36 .....	4
	545	203

Here not only have we three-fifths of the small-pox patients vaccinated, but we have the large and unnatural proportion of 306 vaccinated to 55 unvaccinated above 20 years of age."

Late in life it will be seen the number of cases of small-pox amongst the vaccinated is large, amongst the unvaccinated small.

The other statistics of Dr. Russell are also opposed to what we know to occur in the country at large, and cannot be reconciled with the facts already stated.

Suppose, however, that vaccination did really accomplish all that its advocates claim for it; suppose, for the sake of argument, that no single case of small-pox after vaccination had been ever known, and that, therefore, Jenner's operation was really a thorough protection against small-pox, what then? Should it be adopted? Most certainly not. The evils that follow in its wake are of so frightful a character that we had better endure the small-pox a dozen times over than to bring them upon ourselves and our fellows. The celebrated John Hunter most wisely remarked—"The introduction by inoculation of mineral poisons or vegetable poisons is hazardous, and in certain quantities may be destructive; but the introduction of animal products from another living body, be it a man, a cow, or even the ass, is infinitely more pernicious, because allied to it in being vitalised."

Dr. Copland, whose Dictionary of Practical Medicine is a lasting monument of his immense intellect, great skill, and practical knowledge, says—"Half a century has brought us to the position that we are doubtful which to prefer, vaccination with its present benefits and future contingent dangers, or inoculation with its possible present dangers and its future advantages." It must be borne in mind that Dr. Copland was a believer in vaccination—that is, he supposed some good did really arise from it, and yet he considered it doubtful whether the evils following it did not more than counterbalance any benefits that might be experienced. Now, we have proved that there is no good whatever in the operation, and taking that view of it, in what light must these terrible evils appear—evils unredeemed by a single advantage?

Dr. Squirrel, a contemporary of Jenner's, in a pamphlet written in opposition to vaccination thus alludes to him:—

“Had he but seriously reflected upon the specific nature of cow-pox virus, and endeavoured to trace the grease of the horse, whence it sprang, up to its origin, previously to engaging in so momentous a concern, it would have required but a small share of ability to have predicted the dreadful consequences that have since ensued; and I am sorry to have the opportunity of showing that the result of the industry which he has shown in ingrafting an unknown disease into the human constitution neither merits private regard nor public approbation.” This comes to us like a prophecy when we see the terrible evils by which we are now surrounded that have resulted from this foul and disgusting practice of vaccination.

The vaccine matter, according to Professor Huxley, is a living organism, and as such capable of multiplying itself by reproduction by millions in a very short space of time. In his address before the British Association at Liverpool, he remarks, “You are familiar with what happens in vaccination. A minute cut is made in the skin, and an infinitesimal quantity of vaccine matter is inserted into the wound. Within a certain time a vesicle appears in the place of the wound, and the fluid which distends this vesicle is vaccine matter, in quantity a hundred or a thousandfold that which was originally inserted.” Now, what has taken place in the course of this operation? Has the vaccine matter, by its irritative property, produced a mere blister, the fluid of which has the same irritative property? Or does the vaccine matter contain living particles, which have grown and multiplied where they have been planted? The observations of M. Chauveau, extended and confirmed by Dr. Sanderson himself, appear to leave no doubt upon this head. Experiments similar in principle to those of Helmholtz on fermentation and putrefaction have proved that the active element in the vaccine lymph is non-diffusible, and consists of minute particles not exceeding  $\frac{1}{1000000}$  of an inch in diameter, which are made visible in the lymph by the microscope. Similar experiments have proved that two of the most destructive of epizootic diseases—sheep-pox and glanders—are also dependent for their existence and

their propagation upon extremely small living solid particles, to which the title of microzymes is applied. An animal suffering under either of these terrible diseases is a source of infection and contagion to others, for precisely the same reason as a tub of fermenting beer is capable of propagating its fermentation by "infection" or "contagion" to fresh wort. In both cases it is the solid living particles which are efficient, the liquid in which they float, and at the expense of which they live, being altogether passive." Bearing in mind that the vaccine virus is the product of a foul disease—is, in fact, diseased matter—we can easily judge what must be the result of the introduction of the very smallest portion of it into the human body. Disease germs are multiplied by millions, and the whole system becomes contaminated. Can we wonder, then at the foul and filthy maladies thus imparted to healthy children? How many thousands of constitutions are completely ruined by this process. Every person who has used his eyes must have witnessed scores of infants who were strong, buoyant, and vigorous, until this operation was performed, and who never had a day's health afterwards.

Even the *Lancet*, bitterly as it is opposed to the anti-vaccinators, remarked a few years since—"So widely extended is the dread that, along with the prophylactic remedy, something else may be inoculated, lest the germ of future diseases may be planted, that few medical practitioners would care to vaccinate their own children from a source of the purity of which they were not well assured." But how can any man be well assured of the purity of the source of vaccine virus which has been circulating in human constitutions for seventy years, and which had its origin in the filthy discharge issuing from sores on the heels of a diseased horse? Purity! Bah! It smells rank. This same *Lancet* remarks elsewhere—"There is a belief—it may be denounced as a prejudice, but it is not the less a deeply-rooted conviction, and one not confined to the poor or the ignorant—that if the vaccine disease may be transmitted by inoculation, other diseases less beneficial may be propagated in the same manner and by the same opera-



tion. Many a parent of high and low degree dates constitutional disease in her offspring to vaccination with bad matter. Who shall say that this etiological conclusion is always false?" Who shall say that this is always false? Ah! who indeed? We say, most unhesitatingly, that it is true in an enormous number of cases—cases of terrible import. The mischief done by this said vaccination will perhaps never be thoroughly known.

Dr. Shew, *New York Medical and Surgical Journal*, remarks—"Not only does vaccination cause subsequent unfavourable effects, but it sometimes endangers life at the time, and in some instances destroys the child. I have myself known most fearful convulsions to be brought on by it, and that in children apparently in the firmest health." The late Sir Culling Eardley lost his life in this way, and amputation of the arms as a result of vaccination is by no means so uncommon as many persons would imagine.

Dr. Drysdale, who has had large experience in such cases, writes in the *Medical Times*—"On the 9th of May, , I saw with Mr. Lowne a child aged two years. The child was vaccinated April 30. On the ninth day the vesicles were large and filled out; there was a papular eruption over the body, and the fits first appeared. They were thus described by the father:—The child during the fit frothed at the mouth; its eyes were fixed; its jaws stiff, and it was quite unconscious. The legs, arms, and body were rigid during the attack, which lasted about one minute. From 10 a.m. till night of May 8th (ninth day of vaccination) there were only two fits; but from 10 p.m. till the following evening at 5 p.m., the attacks followed each other in rapid succession, sometimes with only five minutes' interval, sometimes longer. The child died some hours afterwards from extension of the spasm to the muscles of respiration." Mr. Massey Harding, F.R.C.S., an eminent English surgeon and a defender of vaccination, remarks—"There is a case reported in the *Gazette Hebdomadaire*, No. 28, of a healthy child, aged two years, whose life was nearly lost through phlegmonous inflammation following

vaccination. A succession of abscesses formed during six weeks in the axillary and sub-pectoral regions. M. Giraldes said that in the Children's Hospital phlegmonous erysipelas was not rare after the most careful vaccination. M. Trousseau reports an instance where erysipelas became general, being originally induced by the two early vaccination of an infant, eight days after birth; and he observes that he had never known a child attacked with erysipelas during the first twenty-five days of its life recover, excepting in those cases in which abscesses have become inter-currently developed. I myself have seen several cases of phlegmonous erysipelas from vaccination where grave fears for the child's life have been excited. In one instance, within the last twelvemonths, I saw a child on the tenth day of vaccination. There was phlegmonous inflammation of the arm to the shoulder, and a profuse discharge of pus was established through one of the punctures. I also know of a case where a fine healthy child was vaccinated by an excellent practitioner of medicine, with every possible care as to the vaccinifer, the cleanliness of the lancet, and the clearness of the lymph. Phlegmonous erysipelas followed and the child died, to the lasting sorrow of the parents and of the medical man." Thousands of such cases are on record. Every medical man has had experience of many. They ought to be published far and wide in order to warn every father and mother against allowing their children to be subjected to the pernicious operation of vaccination.

The most serious effects, however, are those which spring from the introduction of some other disease with the vaccine lymph—a disease that does not necessarily originate with the persons from whom the lymph is directly taken, but from some prior possessor of this transmitted ichor. Dr. Trall remarks, and his experience is that of many others, "I have seen within the last year a most horribly loathsome case of scrofulous disease, in which the patient literally rotted alive at the age of fifteen, from unhealthy virus received when he was but three years of age. Parents often find some of their children tainted with morbid humours, unlike any other mem-

ber of the family, and which they are wholly unable to account for except on the supposition of foul matter taken into the system by vaccination." Foul matter! Yes. Is there any vaccine lymph that is not foul?

Dr. Schieferdecker observes—"It (vaccination) is insufficient as a preventive means, and a cause of many diseases which would have been avoided if vaccination had not taken place, as the hidden disease of one individual is often transferred by vaccination to the vaccinated one. The truth of this assertion is proved by daily experience; thus I have seen a perfectly healthy young girl, born of healthy parents, soon after vaccination, infected with a skin disease, of which the parents of the child, who seemed very healthy, and from whom the vaccine matter was taken, secretly suffered, as afterwards was ascertained." Mr. Massey Harding, to whom reference has been previously made, speaking of the eruptions that frequently follow vaccination, says—"These eruptions are generally of an eczematous nature—the skin is red, a serous fluid exudes freely. Most writers consider dentition the starting-point, and regard its occurrence after vaccination as a coincidence. This may be so; but the explanation certainly does not satisfy the parents of children in whom the eruption takes place immediately after vaccination, and would not satisfy me if it occurred in my own child in a few days after the punctures were made, and at the same time as the vesicle commenced. I bear in mind at this moment that a gentleman, aged 56, not subject to any eruption, was re-vaccinated. The arm was violently inflamed; the matter, as he expressed it, took well. I have previously explained how mistaken such an expression is. This gentleman now, some two or three years after vaccination, is a martyr to an eczematous eruption over the body, and is himself much inclined to blame the vaccination." And would not any man of ordinary common sense be much inclined to blame the vaccination under similar circumstances? To what other source should he ascribe the eruption from which he was suffering? When medical men attempt, as they frequently do, to persuade



parents that maladies arising suddenly in their children after vaccination may have had some other origin, and that the vaccination had nothing whatever to do with the matter, they do not give their patients credit for much common sense.

Dr. Chapman, in the *British Journal of Homœopathy*, observes—"It may be here observed that chronic diseases may be often traced back to the period of vaccination in such a way as to show that the virus was communicated in that way."

Dr. Mitchell, M.P. for Bodmin, in a most able speech, delivered in the House of Commons, on the Compulsory Vaccination Act Amendment Bill, is reported as follows:—"He was opposed to it (compulsory vaccination) on constitutional grounds, as no parents ought to be compelled to have their children vaccinated. He denied that vaccination was any preventive of small-pox, and (affirmed that it) was often the cause of blindness and serofula." For thus speaking out courageously in opposition to the general feelings prevailing in the profession to which he belonged, Dr. Mitchell deserves the thanks of all real friends of humanity and lovers of true freedom. A few such men in the House of Commons would soon repeal the iniquitous Compulsory Vaccination Acts.

Dr. Laurie, of Dunstable, relates his experience as follows: "I vaccinated a child with pure lymph (reputed to be) from the Royal Vaccine Institution. The child, although previously apparently healthy, has ever since been nearly blind; opacities of the cornea developing themselves immediately after the operation. This case, and several others from other vaccinators at Edlesborough, where it was performed, have militated very much against the practice of vaccination among the poor."

Facts of this kind might be multiplied almost without end; those that have been quoted, however, are sufficient to show that vaccination is a most prolific source of evil in the production of a great variety of diseases in human constitutions that had been previously perfectly healthy.

There is one class of maladies that has not as yet been referred to, but which must not be omitted from this small work—a class of so repulsive a nature that but for the im-

portance of the subject one would pass it over unnoticed. For many years past all who took a sufficient interest in this question to investigate it thoroughly have been perfectly aware that syphilis could be, nay, has been, transmitted from one person to another by the process of vaccination. Many medical men denied the possibility of this occurring, and others, although believing that it might occasionally happen, yet considered the instances in which it did occur so rare as to merit very little attention. Now, however, the whole state of the case is altered. Recently it has been shown clearly by some of the most eminent medical men living, that syphilis is thus transmitted, and that the cases in which it happens are by no means so uncommon as was at one time imagined. Now, the bare possibility of such a result as this following the operation of vaccination ought to be sufficient to condemn the whole thing, for what parents would ever think of running the terrible risk of having their children's healthy constitutions contaminated with the most foul and filthy disease that humanity has been subject to? Mr. Massey Harding, already spoken of as a defender of vaccination, and therefore not likely to be prejudiced in favour of our views, remarks—"The possibility that the vaccine lymph in the human arm may have acquired a taint from any constitutional or hereditary disease was recognised and asserted from the first; and the writers before mentioned—Willis, Mosely, &c.—declared that syphilis was propagated in this way from arm to arm. All this was put down as gross exaggeration, and absolutely discredited; yet the more careful and dispassionate inquiries of later physicians have, as we shall presently see, very clearly proved the possibility of communicating syphilis from arm to arm by means of the vaccine lymph." Some most notable cases of this kind have happened recently, cases which show that there is no longer room for the slightest doubt to be entertained on the subject. Many medical men who at one time denied the possibility of such an occurrence have now been compelled from the overwhelming evidence presented to accept the fact. There can be no longer any dispute about the matter.

A very important case is reported in the *Lancet* for December 15, 1866. The paragraph runs as follows:—"Syphilis extensively propagated by vaccination in France.—In a western department of France (Morbihan) some villages have been the theatre of severe syphilitic symptoms upon more than thirty children, who had all been vaccinated from a little girl with six punctures in each arm, the child herself having been operated upon from another who had been vaccinated from lymph preserved between two plates of glass obtained from the authorities. This misfortune created so much sensation that the Academy of Medicine of Paris sent down two commissioners—Messieurs Henry Rogers and De Paul. These gentlemen have just presented their report to the Academy, and this important document ends with the following considerations:—'1. Several of the children whom we have examined were undoubtedly suffering from secondary syphilis. 2. We see no way of explaining this contamination but by vaccination; and we are confident that the cases we have seen were really syphilis engendered by vaccination. 3. As to the origin of the virus, it is very probable that the poison is traceable to the lymph preserved between the pieces of glass supplied by the authorities.' As primary symptoms were also observed among the children, M. Ricord begged the commissioners to insert that fact in their report, which these gentlemen agreed to do. Here we have, unfortunately, again repeated the sad occurrences which took place at Rivolta (Italy) a short time ago."

This case occurred some few years since. More recent facts have confirmed what is here stated. Dr. Coggiola received some vaccine lymph in a tube from Le Conservateur d'Acqui in May, 1861. With this he vaccinated a child 11 months old, in perfect health at the time the operation was performed. Ten days afterwards 46 other children, all in excellent health, were vaccinated with lymph obtained from this one, and from one of these, 17 others—making in all, 63. Out of this number 46 became affected with syphilis, and seven died before the nature of the malady from which they were suffering became known. A commission was appointed to

investigate the case, and their report published by M. le Docteur Pacliotti.

Ricord, the most eminent surgeon in the world, as regards the treatment of syphilitic diseases, twenty years ago denied that syphilis could be communicated by vaccination. A few years later his mind began to undergo a change on the subject, from facts which came under his notice, until, in 1863, he declared that he was quite convinced that this most loathsome disease might be transmitted by vaccination. In a lecture delivered before the Academy of Medicine at Paris, on May 19th, 1863, he remarks—"At first I repulsed the idea that syphilis could be transmitted by vaccination. The recurrence of facts appearing more and more confirmatory, I accepted the possibility, but with reserve, and even with repugnance; but to-day I hesitate no more to proclaim their reality." If this be coupled with a statement made by the same illustrious surgeon a year before, in a lecture that he delivered at the Hotel Dieu, at Paris, it will be seen that in his view vaccination can no longer be tolerated under any circumstances whatever. "If," said he, "the transmission of disease with vaccine lymph is clearly demonstrated, vaccination must be altogether discontinued; for in the present state of science we are in possession of no criterion that may permit the conscientious practitioner to assert that the lymph with which he inoculated is perfectly free from the mixture with tainted blood."

Bear in mind it is an *if* no longer. It is now demonstrated; the inference is clear, vaccination must be discontinued, and that for ever. It is doomed; and although pecuniary interests may uphold it for a short time longer, yet its fall in the good providence of God is certain.

Mr. Hutchinson, M.R.C.S., Surgeon to the London Ophthalmic and Skin Diseases Hospitals, in his evidence before the Parliamentary Committee of 1871, gave his experience of several cases in which syphilis had been transmitted in this way, in one of which an apparently healthy child had thus been the means of transmitting this loathsome disease to eleven grown-up persons. He acknowledged before the Committee that many professional men had said to him in refer-

ence to these cases, "I should not have believed it," some adding, "unless you said it."

The discussion of this subject has been several times brought before the medical societies of London recently, and always with the same result—an overwhelming amount of evidence being produced to show that syphilis can be, and frequently is, transmitted by vaccination. At a meeting of the Royal Medical and Chirurgical Society, held in London on April 25th, 1871, T. B. Curling, Esq., F.R.S., in the chair, this subject was under consideration during the entire evening. Mr. Hutchinson on this occasion presented facts bearing on the question, about which there could be no mistake—facts which showed clearly that syphilis was transmitted by means of vaccination, and that from a child that was apparently healthy. On this occasion Mr. de Méric, an eminent surgeon, who has written largely on syphilitic diseases, made some remarks, which I copy at length, in consequence of their very great importance. The report is from the *British Medical Journal* for April 29th, 1871. "Mr. de Méric congratulated Mr. Hutchinson on the boldness with which he brought forward his cases. It was well known that in this country the idea of the communicability of syphilis by vaccination was generally treated with contempt; he had been often told that the occurrence could not take place. The paper which had been read, however, would change the opinions of many incredulous persons. He thought that it would have been better if the communication had been delayed six weeks or two months, so as to give time to see whether any symptoms of constitutional syphilis appeared in the persons whose cases were described. A vaccine vesicle, without any apparent cause, might show all kinds of changes; he did not, however, question the fact of the conveyance of syphilis in the instance described, but thought that it would have been better to wait for secondary symptoms. He did not agree with the statement, that if pure lymph only were taken from the arm of a syphilitic child, syphilis would not be conveyed. It must be remembered that the vaccine lymph itself was formed from the blood, and therefore it might be the means of conveying



disease, though in many instances it did not do this. Systematic incredulity as to the transmission of syphilis by vaccination ought to be avoided; at the same time, the vaccine vesicle sometimes assumed an alarming appearance, which could not be attributed to the transmission of disease. He had seen cases where the vaccinated parts, without any obvious cause, assumed an appearance very like mucous tubercles. We ought, therefore, to be very careful in inferring that, in a person whose arm after vaccination presented such appearances, they were really due to syphilis. That syphilis could be communicated by vaccination had been proved on the Continent. Some instances in Brittany—thirty or forty children had contracted syphilis in consequence of being vaccinated from a syphilitic child. The occurrence had been investigated by a Commission of the Academy of Medicine in Paris, who had ascertained beyond doubt that the transmission took place as described."

Again and again has this subject been discussed since that time before learned societies, and always with the same result. In a report of a meeting of the same society, held in February, 1873, the transmission of syphilis by vaccination was considered, and facts brought forward which proved beyond the shadow of a doubt that it could occur. The matter may, therefore, be considered settled.

In no other way than this can we account for the alarming spread of enthetic disease recently in this country. The following facts, from the Registrar-General's Report for 1864, have a most important bearing on the subject:—"In the ten years from 1857 to 1866, no less than 12,786 lives have been destroyed in England and Wales by enthetic disease (syphilis, by transmission, &c.) alone. The number of deaths registered in each of the ten years was 957, 1,006, 1,089, 1,067, 1,177, 1,245, 1,386, 1,550, 1,647, and 1,662. Allowing for increase of population, the results show that the mortality by this disease is steadily increasing. Thus, to 1,000,000 persons living in each of the years 1857-66, the proportional number of deaths was 50, 52, 56, 54, 59, 62, 68, 75, 79, and 79 respectively." The results published by the Registrar-General show

the lamentable amount of suffering and death which this disease entails upon infant life. Out of 13,914 deaths from enthetic diseases registered in England and Wales in the twelve years 1854-65, no less than 9,512, or 69 per cent., were those of infants under one year of age; in 1854, out of 964 deaths, 577, or 60 per cent., were those of infants under one year of age; in 1865, out of 1,647 deaths, 1,155, or 70 per cent., were those of infants who had not completed their first year of life. In London, in the twelve years 1854-65, 3,370 deaths were registered from enthetic disease; in 1854 the deaths numbered 206; in 1865 they were 392. Of the 3,370 deaths, the large number of 2,587, or 77 per cent., were those of infants under one year of age. In 1854, the proportion of deaths of infants to total deaths was 43 per cent.; in 1865, it was 76 per cent. The deaths registered from enthetic disease represent only a small proportion of the cases; and the syphiline sets up actions which affect various organs, and gives rise to diseases referred to other causes of death. That so many infants should be infected from birth, and die of this pernicious disease, is greatly to be deplored."

Here you have an enormous increase of hereditary disease of a syphilitic character. How is this to be accounted for? Primary syphilis does not increase: in fact it rather diminishes, since the treatment at present adopted is more successful than that employed a few years since. There is only one way in which this can be explained, which is by transmission from one person to another, and this occurs through the agency of vaccination. If we sow tares, can we expect to reap wheat? If we sow corruption, can we expect that good health will be the result? If the product of a foul disease be infused into the life-current of the blood, would it not be contrary to all known laws to expect anything else than a harvest of similar diseases to crop out in the physical system? Of course, it would.

Now, in the face of such terrible facts as have been brought forward, of what possible value are the statistics of Dr. James B. Russell in reference to Glasgow? Let this question be

dealt with on the broad ground that I have taken up, and the result no one can fail to see. Vaccination is one of the most gigantic shams of the age. It has completely failed in accomplishing that for which alone it was introduced, whilst, on the other hand, it has spread around us disease and death on every hand. It is high time, therefore, that sensible men awoke from the lethargy in which they have been so long resting, and aroused themselves to action, to crush out at once and for ever that great foe of human health—**COMPULSORY VACCINATION.**

## APPENDIX.

---

### OPINIONS OF A FEW EMINENT MEDICAL PRACTITIONERS AND OTHERS.

SIR WILLIAM JOHNSON, physician to William IV., wrote as follows:—"There was more quackery in the profession than out of it; and I declare it to be my most conscientious opinion, that if there were not a single physician, or surgeon, or apothecary, or druggist in the world, there would be less mortality among mankind than there is now."

SIR ASTLEY COOPER testifies:—"Medical art is founded on conjecture and improved by murder."

Dr. REID said:—"More infantile subjects are—perhaps diurnally—destroyed by the mortar and pestle, than in ancient Bethlehem fell victims to the Herodian massacre."

The celebrated MAGENDIE, when addressing his students, said—"Gentlemen, medicine is a great humbug. I know it is called science. Science indeed! It is nothing like science. Doctors are merely empirics, when they are not charlatans."

Dr. MASON GOOD, wrote:—"The science of medicine is a barbarous jargon, and the effects of our medicines on the human system in the highest degree uncertain, except, indeed, that they have destroyed more lives than war, pestilence, and famine combined."

The *Dublin Medical Journal*, said:—"Assuredly the uncertain and most unsatisfactory art that we call medical science is no science at all, but a jumble of inconsistent opinions; of conclusions hastily, and often inaccurately, drawn; of facts misunderstood or perverted; of comparisons without analogy; of hypotheses without reason, and theories not only useless but dangerous."

Dr. COPLAND, in his *Dictionary of Practical Medicine*, says (page 823):—"Just half a century has elapsed since the discovery and introduction of vaccination, and after a quarter of a century of most transcendent laudation of the measure, with merely occasional whisperings of doubts, and after another quarter of a century of reverberated encomiums from well-paid Vaccination Boards, raised with a view of overbearing the

increased murmurings of disbelief (now a vast deal more increased, and rapidly increasing) among those who observe and think for themselves, the middle of the nineteenth century finds the majority of the profession in all latitudes and hemispheres doubtful as to the preponderance of advantages, present and prospective, to be obtained either from inoculation or vaccination." Dr. Copland also says, "that vaccination favours the prevalence of several forms of scrofula."

Dr. JOSEF HERMANN, who was head physician at the Imperial Hospital, Vienna, from 1858 to 1861, in the *Naturarz*, a scientific journal of the city, has recently published a long article, in which he says:—"My experience of small-pox during those six years of bed-side attendance has given me the right, or rather, has imposed on me the duty of taking part in the bold and spirited onslaught on vaccination which is now being carried on in Switzerland, Germany, England, and other countries. . . . I am convinced that vaccination is the greatest mistake and delusion in the science of medicine: a fanciful illusion in the mind of the discoverer; a phenomenal apparition devoid of scientific foundation, and wanting in all the conditions of scientific possibility.

Dr. STOWELL, for twenty-five years a vaccine physician, says:—"The nearly general declaration of my patients enables me to proclaim that vaccination is not only an illusion, but a curse to humanity. More than ridiculous—it is irrational—to say that any corrupt matter taken from boils and blisters of an organic creature could affect the human body otherwise than to injure it. . . . I myself know the names of a hundred physicians who think like me."

Professor BARTLETT, lecturer on medicine in the New York University, writes that in 203 children who had been vaccinated 133 died of consumption and 70 of other diseases; in 95 who were not vaccinated 30 only died of consumption and 65 of other diseases; therefore vaccination is simply an agency for the propagation of consumption."

The *Medical Times and Gazette* for January, 1854, says:—"Consumption has widely spread since the introduction of vaccination."

Dr. A. H. CARON, of Paris, chevalier of the Legion of Honour and member of many learned societies, in a letter to Dr. Chaplin of Portman Square, London, which the latter published two or three years ago, says:—"For my own part, it is long since I have positively refused to vaccinate at any price, while the successful results of the small-pox cases I have treated are beyond appeal. . . . In a word, I maintain that vaccination is a bauble, gilded over indeed, by Act of Parliament, but which is a



bauble still, with which doctors rock—too often to a fatal sleep—the gullible children of the world.”

Dr. HITCHMAN, formerly a public vaccinator at Liverpool, and now living there, says:—“I have seen hundreds of children killed by vaccination.”

Dr. COLLINS, M.D., in his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons in 1871, says:—“Has ceased to vaccinate 10 or 12 years. Had known persons who had been vaccinated and re-vaccinated suffer dreadfully from small-pox, two of whom died in the most hideous confluent form, after successful vaccination and re-vaccination; one of them three times vaccinated. Has vaccinated thousands, but at last abandoned the practice, and gave up at least £500 a-year by so doing. Has found that cow-poxing weakened the powers of vitality, and often proved fatal. It imparts or calls into activity diseases which would otherwise remain dormant, such as syphilis, scrofula, &c. Thinks it instrumental in swelling the bills of mortality to a most alarming extent. Has often seen children with syphilitic eruptions after vaccination, whose parents were free from taint. Diarrhœa is by no means an uncommon attendant on vaccination, terminating in ulceration and death.” Dr. Collins observed:—“That at the camp at Shorncliffe, when the small-pox broke out, many of the re-vaccinated soldiers died, or at least had arms amputated in consequence of vaccination.”

The same observation made by LOUIS NAPOLEON at Chalons, prompted him to forbid re-vaccination; and after the same process upon the Federal prisoners in Camp Sumpter, Georgia, in 1864, no less than 10,000 died.

The late Dr. EPPES, 25 years director of the Jenner Institute, London, and who had vaccinated 120,000, says:—“The vaccine virus is a poison. It is neither antidote nor corrigent; nor does it neutralise the small-pox, but only paralyses the power of a good constitution, so that the disease falls back upon the mucous membrane. Nobody has the right to transplant such a very mischievous poison compulsorily into the life of a child.”

Dr. GARTH WILKINSON, of London, says:—“Thoughtful dentists suggest vaccination as a probable cause of the early decay of teeth in this age. The surmise gains countenance from the consideration that the germs of the second or permanent teeth are appearing at the time selected by Government for performing vaccination. Has often, almost daily, heard parents say, ‘My children have never been the same since they were vaccinated.’ Infers that many subtle forms of disease, not easily traceable, were really owing to vaccination.”

DEPAUL laid before the Academy of Paris “450 authenticated cases where syphilis was transplanted by the vaccination performed by high standing physicians.”

Well may Dr. BAYARD exclaim:—"Adieu to vaccination! we will have no more of it. Syphilis has revealed the criminal. It is a crime against nature."

Dr. LONGSTAFFE, a prominent physician of Edinburgh, speaks of it as "This monstrous fraud."

Professor NEWMAN says;—"Nothing can justify Parliament in enacting a medical creed, or enforcing any special medical procedure. When fatal results follow from vaccination, it is an infamous and foul murder."

The *Christian World* says:—"The vaccine compulsory law is compulsory murder."

Dr. GREGORY said:—"I am led to the conviction that 'pure lymph,' being the product of consumption, carries the seeds of such contamination with it, whether it be syphilis, scrofula, mania, or any other blood disease."

Dr. SIMON himself admits—"It is quite certain that blood becomes mixed with the lymph, and the blood of syphilitic persons conveys syphilis."

Mr. JOHN FRASER, of Newfield House, near Johnstone, in letters addressed to the Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, Home Secretary of State, in 1869-70, describes "pure lymph" as follows:—"That common deceptive phrase, 'pure lymph,' or 'pure vaccine matter,' is a contradiction in terms. No such thing exists; it would be quite as appropriate to say pure filth, pure disease, pure corruption, pure rottenness. The simple truth is, vaccine matter—be it taken from cow, heifer, horse, or human being—is essentially gross, abominable, diseased, corrupted matter, the product of a foul disease; and to put this unhealthy matter into a healthy body seems, in truth, to be the perfection of insanity, of which practice sound sanitary philosophy should only feel ashamed; and by and by it will. What was Jenner's boasted original cow-pox matter? Listen. Look at that horse there, as lean as death, dying of consumption, breathing like a suffocating asthmatic patient, limping with diseased legs, as if about to fall. Look at his heels, swelled like a monster turnip, excreting the most abominable stinking humour, or grease, as the ostlers call it. Well, Jenner took this consumptive humour and introduced it into the blood of a cow. By and by the cow sickens and fevers; and is it any wonder? Ulcers break out on the cow, called 'cow-pox,' the product of consumptive horse-grease; nature tries to cure the ill-used, the poisoned cow; it drives the abominable matter to the skin, and then it is carefully collected by the vaccinators from the ulcers; and this is the precious stuff with which Jenner poisoned as many helpless children as he could obtain."

The Rev. Wm. HUME-BORNE, writing to a friend, 4th October,

1873, says:—"The Cheltenham Board of Guardians recently and unanimously petitioned the Local Government Board not again to put in motion the compulsory clauses of the Vaccination Acts within the Cheltenham Union. On the 1st of August, 1873, the Local Government Board informed Mr. Thomas Riley, of Portwood, Stockport, 'that the law has confided to the Guardians an absolute discretion with respect to prosecutions for non-vaccination, and that the Local Government Board have no authority to interfere with the exercise of the discretion, or to prescribe to the Guardians the course which they should adopt.' The Dewsbury Guardians have positively refused to appoint even a vaccination officer, and have tendered to the Local Government Board a series of substantial reasons for their refusal. The Keighley Guardians have resolved not to prosecute any one for non-vaccination, and the Local Government Board have declared (29th July, 1873) that they 'are not prepared to say that the resolution is in itself absolutely illegal.' On these facts being communicated to the Leek Board of Guardians, and to the Guardians of Ulverston, they both at once withdrew from prosecutions which they had ordered to be instituted. Now, I submit that the Local Government Board have practically given up the battle. Such being the case, our friends in all quarters may take heart, and help to utterly exterminate compulsory vaccination—that gross medical superstition which could never in any instance do anything else but harm.—WILLIAM HUME-ROTHERY.—Merton Lodge, Tivoli, Cheltenham."

# THE MOTHERS' ANTI-COMPULSORY VACCINATION LEAGUE.

## PATRONESSES.

La Comtesse A. de Noailles. | The Countess Howe. | The Hon. Mrs. Foley.

## GENERAL COMMITTEE.

Mrs. George Adley, Cork.	Mrs. General Lane, Jersey.
Mrs. Mundeford Allen, Suffolk.	Mrs. Mathews, Great Malvern.
Mrs. T. Baker, Workingham.	Miss Moore, London.
Mrs. George Cotter Beale, Cork.	Mrs. Morris, Upper Tooting.
Mrs. Alexander Benzeley, London.	Mrs. Nevill, Hastings.
Miss Benzeley, London.	Mrs. F. W. Newman, Weston-Super-
Mrs. Bruce, Massachusetts.	Mare.
Mrs. Josephine Butler, Liverpool.	Mrs. Nichols, Malvern.
Mrs. George Burdis, London.	Miss Osborne, London.
Mrs. George Cardew, Suffolk.	Mrs. Pearce, Chapham.
Miss Cartwright, London.	Mrs. John Pickering, Leeds.
Mrs. Caven Southampton.	Mrs. Pitman, Manchester.
*Mrs. Collins, Regent's Park.	Mrs. Pratt, Durham.
Madame Colman, London.	Mrs. Roberts, Bridgewater.
Mrs. Keningale Cook, Highgate.	Mrs. Robertson, Paisley.
Mrs. Ditchburn, London.	Mrs. Robinson, Manchester.
Mrs. Dornbusch, Victoria Park.	*Miss Roche, Paris.
Mrs. Eadie, Glasgow.	Miss Fredericka Rowan, London.
Mrs. Fawcett, Hastings.	Mrs. Robert Russell, Cork.
Miss Gerdtsen, Holstein.	Mrs. Skelton, London.
Mrs. George Gibbs, Darlington.	Mrs. Thomas Smith, Cork.
Mrs. Jonathan Gillett, Banbury.	Mrs. May Smith, Massachusetts.
Mrs. Charles Gillett, Banbury.	Mrs. Tubb, London.
Miss Caroline Goldsmid, Upper Tooting.	Mrs. W. H. Thomson, Inverness.
Mrs. Makdongall Gregory, Hyde Park.	Mrs. Thornton, London.
Mrs. Hamilton, Streatham.	Mrs. Tyndall, Birmingham.
Mrs. D. Hands, London.	Mrs. Alice Vibbert, Boston.
Mrs. Hickson, Dublin.	Mrs. Vickers, Brighton.
Mrs. Hill, Chesterfield.	Mrs. Warren, Wandsworth Road.
Miss Holland, London.	*Mrs. Garth Wilkinson, London.
Mrs. Hume-Rothery, Cheltenham.	Miss Wilkinson, London.
Miss Ingram, New York.	Mrs. Alfred Wormum, London.
Mrs. W. E. Kenworthy, Leeds.	Mrs. Young, London.

Executive Committee, marked

## MEDICAL REFEREES.

— Acworth, M.D., 18 Albert Mansions, Victoria Street, S.W.  
 F. Du Rocher Angé, M.D., Newport, Isle of Wight.  
 William Bell, M.D., 18 Hertford Street, Mayfair, London.  
 W. J. Collins, M.D., 1 Albert Terrace, Regent's Park, London.  
 F. W. Crik, M.D., U.S., 6 Gwyn Street, Bedford.  
 James Ellis, M.D., 337 Strand.  
 William Gagey, M.D., King Street, Wigan.  
 Richard Griffith, Ch.M.T.C.D., Millicent, Dunkettle, Co. Cork.  
 J. de Grób, M.D., 11 Upper Wimpole Street, London.  
 Edward Haughton, M.D., Guernsey.  
 Edwin Hearne, M.D., F.R.C.S., England, Southampton.  
 William Hitchman, M.D., 29 Erskine Street, Islington Square, Liverpool.

J. Mackenzie, M.D., Provost, Inverness.  
 T. L. Nichols, M.D., Aldwyn Tower, Malvern.  
 Charles Pearce, M.D., 19 Nottingham Place, Regent's Park, London.  
 John Pratt, Esq., Surgeon, 12 Leazes Place, Durham.  
 John Skelton, Sen., Physician and Surgeon, 74 Coburg Street, Plymouth.  
 John Skelton, Jun., M.R.C.S., Eng., 66 Gower Street, London.  
 Heber Smith, M.D., Massachusetts.  
 D. Turnbull, M.D., LL.D., 16 Cambray, Cheltenham.  
 J. J. Garth, Wilkinson, M.D., 76 Wimpole Street, London.

## TREASURER.

Mrs. Garth Wilkinson.

## BANKERS.

Messrs. Williams, Deacon & Co., 20 Birchlin Lane, E.C.

## HONORARY SECRETARIES.

La Comtesse A. de Noailles, and Miss Roche.

## OFFICE.

64 Berners Street, Oxford Street, London, W.

## FOREIGN CORRESPONDENTS.

Dr. A. Bayard, Villeneuve, St. George, Paris.  
 Dr. Carl Both, Boston, U.S.  
 The Rev. E. J. Bruce, Massachusetts.  
 Dr. A. Capados, The Hague, Holland.  
 Dr. J. Emery Corderre, Montreal, Canada West.  
 Baron Dirckinck Holmfeld, Holstein.  
 Rev. A. Kuyper, Amsterdam.  
 Dr. Verde de Lisle, Paris.  
 Dr. C. C. G. Nittinger, Stuttgart, Wurtemberg.  
 Dr. Schieferdecker, New York.  
 M. Julius Zuppinger, Baden, Argovie, Switzerland.

This Society is formed to unite all who are working for the Repeal of the Compulsory Clauses of the Vaccination Acts, as administered under the present nefarious and injurious system,—To influence Parents to preserve the Health of their Children by persuading them to pay the fines rather than submit to the Vaccination of their Children, when their conscience or experience are against the operation; and to help poor Parents to pay these Fines when they have already paid them once or twice themselves, or have lost children, or had them hopelessly diseased through Vaccination—both misfortunes being of weekly occurrence among the poor who are obliged to take their Children to the Public Vaccinator,—To circulate information by means of Essays, Tracts, &c.,—To form Branch Associations,—To collect evidence and to petition Parliament.

Subscriptions, Donations, the Names of all who wish to join this Society will be thankfully received by the *Treasurer*, Mrs. Garth Wilkinson, 4 Finchley Road, N.W.; Mrs. R. B. Gibbs, *Resident Hon. Sec. pro tem*, 64 Berners Street, Oxford Street, London, W.; Messrs. Williams, Deacon & Co., *Bankers*, 20 Birchlin Lane, Cornhill, London, E.C.

Post Office Orders may be made payable to Elizabeth S. Gibbs, at the Vere Street Post Office, Oxford Street, London, W. Subscriptions due on the 1st of January.



## ANTI-VACCINATION PUBLICATIONS.

- Essay on Vaccination. By Dr. Bayard.
- Have you been Vaccinated; And what Protection is it against the Small-pox? By Dr. Collins.
- Vaccination Useless and Injurious. By Dr. Sexton.
- Vaccination a Delusion: Compulsory Vaccination a Great Political Blunder. By Dr. Skelton.
- Vaccination Viewed Politically. By Professor Newman.
- Ira Connell; or, The Evils of Vaccination: A Touching Personal Narrative of Life-long Suffering from Vaccination. By Ira Connell.
- A Free State and Free Medicine. By Dr. Garth Wilkinson.
- Vaccination. By John Pickering.
- Essays on Vaccination. By Dr. T. C. Pearce: and by Dr. Nottinger.
- Vaccination and the Vaccination Laws. By the Rev. Wm. Hume-Rothery.
- Important Facts on Vaccination. By Edmund Procter.
- A Series of Letters on Vaccination, addressed to the Right Hon. H. A. Bruce, Home Secretary of State. 1869. By John Fraser.
- One Hundred and Twenty-one Reasons why we Object to Vaccination. By J. Wilcockson.
- The New Era; a Monthly Journal of Eclectic Medicine. By George Sexton, M.A., M.D., D.Sc.
- Doctors, Vaccination, and Utilitarianism. By H. Strickland Constable.
- Think before you Vaccinate. By George Cardew, of the University of Oxford.
- Disasters from Vaccination. By Edward Ballard, M.D.
- A Safe, Speedy, and Certain Cure for Small-pox. By John Rose.

— — —

Most of the above, and a great variety of Tracts on the same subject, can be had from JOHN THOMSON, 39 John Street, Glasgow.

